

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 656
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	4.38	4.58	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.25	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1343/1406	3.63	4.16	4.32	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.83	4.47	4.24	4.17	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.88	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.50	4.36	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1460/1650	3.75	4.27	4.22	4.28	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.75	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	4.50	4.63	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.63	4.84	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1489/1549	4.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	3.88	4.22	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.83	4.25	4.29	4.09	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1363/1378	3.13	4.08	4.31	4.08	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	899/ 904	2.83	3.78	4.03	3.94	1.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1442/1670	4.38	4.58	4.31	4.23	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	622/1666	4.25	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1406	3.63	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	3.83	4.47	4.24	4.17	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	3.88	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	899/1528	4.50	4.36	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1135/1650	3.75	4.27	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	4.75	4.87	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	953/1626	4.50	4.63	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1157/1559	4.63	4.84	4.46	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	4.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1293/1546	4.13	4.52	4.32	4.32	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1125/1323	3.25	4.12	4.00	3.91	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	996/1384	3.88	4.22	4.10	3.92	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	3.83	4.25	4.29	4.09	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	867/1378	3.13	4.08	4.31	4.08	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 904	2.83	3.78	4.03	3.94	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	147/ 232	4.00	4.00	4.19	4.25	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	223/ 239	3.33	3.67	4.21	4.35	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.45	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	78/ 218	4.50	4.50	4.18	4.47	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	2.50	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	2.50	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.50	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	21/ 27	4.00	4.00	4.54	4.46	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	4.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	4.50	4.92	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 0	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	1			

Course-Section: ELC 043 8010
 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI
 Instructor: MUNDY, SUSAN E
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 658
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.58	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1274/1528	3.50	4.36	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.27	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.63	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.84	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.22	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.25	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.08	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.78	4.03	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	17	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.58	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	477/1666	4.62	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	2	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	763/1406	4.36	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	673/1615	4.42	4.47	4.24	4.17	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	808/1566	4.08	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	546/1528	4.42	4.36	4.12	4.00	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	417/1650	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.28	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	992/1667	4.69	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	191/1626	4.78	4.63	4.11	4.07	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	503/1559	4.77	4.84	4.46	4.47	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.92	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	549/1549	4.62	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	582/1546	4.62	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	663/1323	4.08	4.12	4.00	3.91	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.22	4.10	3.92	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.25	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.08	4.31	4.08	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	3.78	4.03	3.94	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.67	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.50	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	2.50	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	2.50	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.50	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	4.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	4.50	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRITNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 659
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: EDMONDS, LORI M
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 660
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.58	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.48	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.36	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.63	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.84	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.91	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 071 8010
 Title ESL TOP III: WRT FR RE
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 661
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.58	4.31	4.23	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.47	4.24	4.17	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.36	4.12	4.00	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.63	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.84	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1125/1323	3.25	4.12	4.00	3.91	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.22	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.25	4.29	4.09	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.08	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.78	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	147/ 239	4.00	3.67	4.21	4.35	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.50	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 79	4.50	4.50	4.45	4.59	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	4.00	3.97	3.99	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	39/ 41	2.50	2.50	4.50	3.91	2.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	35/ 38	2.50	2.50	4.19	4.07	2.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 38	4.50	4.50	4.62	4.63	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	25/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.27	4.42	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	16/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.47	4.28	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	23/ 28	4.00	4.00	4.64	4.59	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/ 16	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.83	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	21/ 27	4.00	4.00	4.54	4.46	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	10/ 10	4.00	4.00	4.84	4.75	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	6/ 6	4.50	4.50	4.92	4.83	4.50

Course-Section: ELC 071 8010
 Title ESL TOP III: WRT FR RE
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 661
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	2	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						